

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated June 15, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, no claims are amended; no claims are canceled and no new claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Japanese Laid-Open Patent Publication 10-091345 (to Matsuzaki)(hereinafter "Matsuzaki"). Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,211 (to Diessner)(hereinafter "Diessner"). Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Matsuzaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,461,202 (to Sera et al.)(hereinafter "Sera").

The rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a flexible printed circuit film connected to the wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part." None of the cited references including Matsuzaki teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Initially, Applicant notes the following errors in the rejection. First, the Office rejects claims 1 and 10 in the statement of the rejection. However, the body of the rejection refers to claims 1 and 11 (See Office Action at page 6). Second, the Office rejects claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). However, the Office cites to 35 U.S.C. §102(e) (See Office Action at page 6).

Turning to the substance of the rejection, Applicant respectfully reminds the Office of the legal requirement for anticipation:

"To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP 2131 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that Matsuzaki fails to teach and disclose every element of at least claim 1. Matsuzaki fails to teach a flexible printed circuit film. Matsuzaki merely teaches an insulating substrate. Matsuzaki also fails to teach at least an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part. Matsuzaki merely teaches a reinforcement for the insulating substrate. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that because Matsuzaki fails to teach every element of at least claim 1, the rejection of at least said claim is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-9, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 10 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 10 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 10 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "forming a flexible printed circuit film connected to the wiring terminal; forming an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and forming an adhesion-reinforcing part on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part." None of the cited references including Matsuzaki teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The rejection of claim 1 applies equally to claim 10 and will not be repeated herewith.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that because Matsuzaki fails to teach every element of at least claim 10, the rejection of at least said claim is improper. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully submits that claim 10 and claims 11-18, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 10, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 are allowable over the cited references in that claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 recite a combination of elements including, for example, “a flexible printed circuit film connected to the wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” None of the cited references including Matsuzaki, Diessner, or Applicant’s Related Art teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

First, it is respectfully noted that the Office appears to have rejected claims 9 and 18 in further view of Applicant’s Related Art. This rejection is improper. First, claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17 and 18 were rejected over Matsuzaki in view of Diessner only. To introduce another alleged art against said claims is technically in error. Second, Applicant’s Related Art is not Admitted Prior Art that may be used as an admission against said claims. Applicant’s Related Art is merely art that may or may not be related to the present invention(s). Accordingly, the rejection of at least said claims is in error and improper and Applicant respectfully requests that said rejections be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 are allowable over the cited references in that claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 recite a combination of elements including, for example, “a flexible printed circuit film connected to the wiring terminal; an adhesion part corresponding to a location where the flexible printed circuit film is connected to the wiring terminal; and an adhesion-reinforcing part formed

on a rear surface of the touch panel device that increases an adhesive bonding strength of the adhesion part.” None of the cited references including Matsuzaki, Diessner, or Sera teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.


In conclusion, Applicant respectfully notes that because the anticipation rejection is flawed and the rejection of claims 9 and 18 further improper for the reasons as noted, finality is improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Registration No.: 41,786  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant